THE MALICE OF THE Independent-Agent AGAIN REBUKED,

And his Falshood Detected; Chiefly about the Man Christ Jesus; in Reply to his Answer to a Sheet, Entituled,

The Independent-Agent.

His Lyes shall not so effect it, Jer. 48. 10.

SInce that *William Haworth* (an *Independent*-Guide) hath pretended *he was encouraged to print against us, and that we might well say, that we have all this while waged War not only with single W. H. but with all the* Independent *Party in England; and that he need not fear but that he shall have their Prayers and Encouragement to stand by him, &c.* in his Book entit. *The Naz.* p. 38, 39.

This eminent, thus popular, thus potent an Agent and Representative of all the *Independent* Party has W. H. rendred himself, which if true, their Cause must needs be concluded in him, either to stand or fall with him. But being closely urged in our last sheet against him, 'To produce his Deputation for this his undertaking against us under the hands of some of the chief Pastors of 'the *Independent* Congregations, or otherwise we shall absolutely 'look upon his Work as the Fruit of his own silly Presumption 'and Usurpation: as we had cause so to do since he bragg'd so loud, and so lively undertook to personate all the *Independent* Party in *England*. But instead of producing such Deputation, he gives us this put off, viz. *My Deputation for this Work is from the Word of Christ*, Jud. 3. *I need no other Deputation*, p. 8. of his sheet Answer.

Whereas any Counterfeit may pretend the same from others Lines; an immediate Mission he pretends not for his Work against us; he comes off after a sorry and beggarly manner here; what's this to his approbation from his *honourable Party*, the *Independents*, whom he has taken on him to represent and personate? but we thought they were wiser then to trust their Cause in his Hands or Management; therefore how plain is it, that his Work against us in his several Books and Pamphlets, is a Fruit of his own silly presumption and usurpation, and that he is but a Counterfeit Agent, who appears to represent such an *honourable Party*, as he calls them, and not so much as two or three of those most honourable among them dare trust him with their Cause, or adventure to own him in print; 'tis probable the wiser sort of them also look upon Him to be a presumptuous Busie-Body, except some of his prejudiced Hearers, Benefactors, and such like.

Note also, that we referr'd him for a more full Answer (to the Substance of his Book) then we have given about *Christ's manhood*, entituled, *The Way Cast Up, &c.* by *George Keith*: But this he takes no notice of, but proceeds to cover himself with his former Falshoods and Reiterations of Matters already answered.

To make his *Independent* Cause seem very credible, he gives

us this proffer, *viz. If the* Independents *please to take cognizance of the Debate, I dare appeal to them*, pag. 1. What a wonderful Hazard this man dares run! that he dares adventure to appeal to his Own Party! It seems he has far more Confidence in them then they have in him, in that hitherto they dare not so far trust him as to allow him a Deputation, or vindicate his Work in Print, he is left to shift for himself; only he would make us believe, he has them all on his side, because of his owning their *Savoy Confession*, whenas he has writ far more against the *Quakers* then that comes to in his several Books and Pamphlets, containing many false Doctrines, Contradictions, Slanders, Abuses and Perversions, which are not in that Confession; and had he not persisted therein, we might have forborn farther taking notice thereof; but we must yet shew what a bad Cause his is, that needs Lyes and Slanders for its Refuge.

And now again, as to some of those horrid Falshoods and Blasphemies which he most falsly saith *Are the Quakers Doctrines*, whereof he saith, *Three are cull'd out of Thirteen, so that Ten remain upon us still*, pag. 2. as if we granted all we have not cited, which also is an implicit Untruth; for we plainly tell him (after the citation of a few of his Slanders and Reproachful Language) viz. 'These, with many more Slanders and Revilings 'are dispersed throughout W. H's last Book; see *Independent Agent*, p. 3.

The first of the three that he sayes are the *Quakers* Doctrines, is, *That the Ordinances of the Gospel are vain and ceased.* This being denyed, he quotes *William Penn* thus, viz. 'I affirm, Circumcision is as much in force as Water-Baptism, and the Paschal 'Lamb as Bread and Wine —— the Appellation Ordinances of 'Christ I therefore Renounce as—Inevangelical—they are—not 'now required, *Reason against Railing*, pag. 108, 109. From whence this *Independent* Agent concludes, viz. *There is Proof enough that the* Quakers *Doctrine is, that the Ordinances of the Gospel are vain and ceased.* Wherein his Charge and Inference is still false, even as to matter of fact; as if the *Quakers* did so teach concerning what are really the Ordinances of the Gospel; which is a falsly begging the Question. W. P. believes not that

Water-Baptism and Bread and Wine, practised by the *Anabaptists*, &c. (against whom he was writing) to be Ordinances of Christ, or now required; he does not say, that the Ordinances of the Gospel or of Christ are vain and ceased, but only that these are not such. See now how W. H. has plainly belyed the *Quakers*.

2. His second Doctrine charged upon the *Quakers* is, *That it was the s'Devil that suffered without the Gates, &c.* for proof he brings us this Certificate, viz.

"WE *whose Names are subscribed do testifie, that when* "*this Question was asked* Samuel Pryor *a* Quaker (*now* "*dwelling at* Hatfield *Hall in* Hartfordshire, *by* Joseph Saward, "*concerning the Soul of Christ being made an Offering for Sin, whe-*"*ther it was God or the Devil that was made an Offering for Sin? "the said* Samuel Pryor *answered, That it was the Devil that was* "*made an Offering for Sin.*

Joseph Saward, Sarah Saward, Sarah Farr.

Note here, that though they have varyed in this Certificate from the words [*Suffered without the Gate* [first charged by *W. Haworth*, and instead thereof to [*was made an Offering for Sin*] which shews his Uncertainty and Fallacy in stating matters of fact; yet both, as stated by him and his Witnesses, being bad enough, are utterly denyed by the *Quakers*, as falsly charged upon them. And by the way let's query of *W. H.* and his Witnesses about their Question, *1st*, If the Question in the said Certificate be owned by the *Independent* Teachers, &c. as a Learned, Sound or Scriptural Question? And *secondly*, If the *Independents* do use thus to Catechize their People, viz. of the Soul of Christ being made an Offering for Sin, whether it was God or the Devil that was made an Offering for Sin? implying that the Soul of Christ (which was made an Offering for Sin, and which he poured out unto Death, &c. *Isa.* 53.) must needs be either God or the Devil; which is as condemnable as the Answer, which they say *Samuel Pryor* gave: for, to say it was the Devil, is Blasphemy; and to say it was God, is not only Unreasonable

and False Doctrine, but also contraty to what W. H. has frequently said of the Soul of Christ's Manhood, as against its being turned into an Immense Deity; therefore he should have reproved *Joseph Saward* for his foolish and ungodly Question (seeing he owns it to be his) as well as *Samuel Pryor*, if guilty of such an Answer, and teach his Hearers better then thus irreverently to catechize any Persons, or to expose their Folly therein in Print, as he has done his Disciple's unsavoury Question, without Reproof. But hear what the Person accused says to clear himself, *viz.*

"THese are to certifie all Persons concerned, that whereas "*William Haworth* hath published in Print, that I *Samuel* "*Pryor* was askt this Question by *Joseph Saward*, concerning the "Soul of Christ being made an Offering for Sin, Whether it was "God or the Devil that was made an Offering for Sin? unto "which Question 'tis said that I answered, That it was the Devil "that was made an Offering for Sin, subscribed *Joseph Saward*, "*Sarah Saward*, *Sarah Farr*. Now this I affirm is a most false "Accusation and wicked Slander; for never was any such Que-"stion asked me by *Joseph Saward*, or any other, nor did ever "any such Blasphemous Words concerning the Soul of Christ "proceed out of my Mouth, or enter into my Heart or Thoughts; "and I am clear in the Sight of God. So the just God, that "knows the Secrets of all Hearts, judge betwixt my Accusers "and me in this matter.

Samuel Pryor.

Now hear what his Father and Brother say in this Matter, *viz.*

"THis is to certifie all whom it may concern, that I am Fa-"ther to *Samuel Pryor*, and that my Son was by me instru-"cted in a Profession of Religion before he was one called a *Qua-"ker*, and since that also hath been careful in reading the Scrip-"tures; and having alwayes lived with me, I have oftentimes "discoursed with him about his Principles since he was a *Quaker*, "and he hath been asked by me, whether he owned the Scrip-

"tures,

" tures, (becauſe he talked of a Light within him) he told me, " he owned them from the beginning to the end, and that Chriſt " which ſuffered without the Gates of *Jeruſalem* was both God " and Man, and that it was this Chriſt Jeſus that was made an " Offering for Sin, and not the Devil, as *Joſeph Saward*, his " Wife and Maid have wrongfully accuſed my Son, in ſaying, " it was the Devil that was offered for Sin; for I never heard him " ſpeak any ſuch words, neither do I believe he ever had ſuch a " Blaſphemous Thought or Word: I my ſelf have been a Hear- " er of *William Haworth*, and formerly had a good Opinion of " him, until I found him ſo forward to print Lyes.

John Pryor the Elder,

" THeſe are to certifie all whom it may concern, that I am " Elder Brother to *Samuel Pryor*, and did live with him " twenty years, and ſince he hath been called a *Quaker* I have had " often Reaſoning with him, and ſeveral Diſputes, and he al- " wayes owned Chriſt Jeſus that ſuffered without the Gates of " *Jeruſalem*. And whereas Mr. *Haworth* hath printed an Accu- " ſation againſt him of *Joſeph Saward*, and his Wife and Maid, " I dare believe it is very falſe; for I never heard my Brother hold " or ſpeak ſuch Principles and Blaſphemous Tenents, as he is in " that Certificate accuſed to ſay.

John Pryor the Younger.

Note that the ſaid *Samuel Pryor* has come ſome years amongſt us, called *Quakers*, and we never underſtood that ever it was his Judgment to ſleight or diſeſteem the Sufferings of Chriſt for Sin, much leſs to ſpeak any ſuch contemptible words of Chriſt, or his Suffering, as are charged upon us concerning him; but if we could find, that he did but at unawares ſpeak any ſuch words as thoſe before cited, in anſwer to *Joſeph Saward*'s abſurd and tempting Queſtion about the Soul of Chriſt, we ſhould ſeverely reprehend and admoniſh him about it; howbeit, if it had been ſo, 'twas no ingenuous part of W. H. or his Hearers to catch and ſnatch away words unadviſedly ſlipping from any Perſon upon

a ſurprizal by a corrupt Queſtion, and then to expoſe him in print to be knockt in the Head in the Streets or High-way for a Blaſphemer, without firſt moderately enquiring into his Principle and Faith in the Matter after ſuch words unwarily ſpoken; and not only ſo, but it muſt be charged as the *Quakers* Doctrine, how abſurd and blaſphemous ſoever: O diſingenuous Perſons! is this your Religion? far ſhort of common Civility and Morality among the very *Heathen.*

3. The *third* Doctrine charged by *William Haworth* upon the *Quakers* is moſt horrid, viz. *That* Mary *was a Whore, and Chriſt a Baſtard.* And for Proof he bids us read the following Certificate, viz.

"*THis is to certifie all whom it may concern, that I whoſe Name*
"*is ſubſcribed did hear* James Naylor *the* Quaker *ſay theſe*
"*words at* York, *in Contempt of Chriſt Jeſus, viz.* Mary was a
"Whore, and Chriſt a Baſtard.

William Craven.

William Craven ſhould have certified the time when, and in what place it was in *York*, and in whoſe Preſence beſides himſelf, that he did hear *J. Naylor* ſay theſe words in Contempt of Chriſt, and on what Occaſion? he ſhould have been plain, if he had not been conſcious and afraid of being manifeſtly detected in this thing; for we are fully perſwaded he is a Falſe Accuſer, and has moſt groſly belyed *James Naylor* in this matter.

1. Becauſe he has written and divulged ſo much in his Books in Honour to Jeſus Chriſt, according to the Scriptures.

2. Becauſe neither W. C. nor any other of his Brethren have given us any ſuch Certificate againſt J. N. either in his Life-time, or ſince, for above theſe twenty years, until of late (many years after J. *N*'s Death) that *W. Haworth* was minded through his deadly Malice to brand the People called *Quakers* therewith, as by telling the World, *Theſe are the* Quakers *Doctrines*, viz. *That it was the Devil that ſuffered without the Gates; that* Mary *was a Whore, and Chriſt a Baſtard*; which are ſo horrid

and

and monſtrous, that its with a Dread and a kind of Reluctancy that we are occaſioned to recite them.

By what follows the Reader may ſee how uncertain and inconſiſtent *William Craven* (who is *William Haworth*'s Witneſs) is with himſelf, viz.

"ABout thoſe words concerning *Mary* and *Chriſt*, whereof "*William Haworth* has charged *James Naylor* and the "People called *Quakers* in Print, *William Craven* lately told me, "That *James Naylor* was Priſoner in *York* Caſtle when he ſpoke "thoſe words, and that it was about thirty years ſince.

Witneſs *H. Stout.*

"Which I ſuppoſe is as true as the Story he told of a Man, "who being ſet upon a Watch on a High Tower (fell aſleep upon "a great Gun) and fell down upon a Pavement, and had no hurt, "and came and knockt at the Caſtle Door, to the Amazement of "them that were within.

H. S.

Something farther added to *William Craven*'s Certificate againſt J. N. as to Time and Place, &c.

"THeſe may certifie, that on the 15th of the 2d moneth, "1678. at the Houſe of *William Rudd* in *Hertford*, *W.* "*Craven* being asked in what year *James Naylor* ſhould ſpeak "thoſe words which were charged to be ſpoken by him in a Cer- "tificate under *William Craven*'s Hand in Print in *William Ha-* "*worth*'s late Sheet, he further ſaith, that it was between twen- "ty ſix and thirty years ſince and that he (J. N.) was then a "Priſoner in *York* Caſtle, and that he could take his Oath of the "Truth hereof.

William Rudd, Richard Thomas.

Note. So ſome through Envy and Malice, or Self-Intereſt, will Forſwear themſelves (and ſo become perjured) to injure others

others by Falſhoods and Forgeries. And if *William Craven* ſhould ſwear to his Certificate before cited, with theſe Circumſtances of Time and Place, it would be no hard matter (if it were before a Judge of Aſſize) to invalidate his Teſtimony, and prove him a Forſworn Perjured Perſon to his utter Diſgrace and Shame; ſince 1ſt, 'tis evident that *James Naylor*, the *Quaker*, ſo called (who as ſuch a one is accuſed) never was Priſoner in *York* Caſtle. 2. That between twenty ſix and thirty years ſince (before the 2d Moneth, 1678.) he was not a *Quaker* that we can underſtand (but an *Independent*, and one of the more Religious and Serious ſort too) much leſs a Priſoner in *York* Caſtle as a *Quaker* (between twenty ſix and thirty years ſince) for it was near the latter-end of the year 1652. that he was Priſoner at *Appleby* in *Weſtmoreland*, and but the Summer before in the ſame year came forth as a *Quaker*, and it was ſome time after his coming forth that his Mouth was open'd to preach and diſpute for Truth, having before that been a Member of an *Independent*-Society at *Horbery* in *Yorkſhire*, having been an Officer under General *Lambert* in his Troop; vid. *Saul's Errand*, pag. 29. and the Narrative of his *Examination*, pag. 2. with the following Teſtimony.

York, *the* 13*th of the* 2*d Moneth*, 1678.

"EDward *Nightingall* and *Thomas Waite*, who ſerved their "Apprentiſhips in the City of *York*, and both having "been Houſe-keepers near thirty years, the ſaid *Thomas Waite* "being all along converſant with Priſoners that came in upon a "Conſcientious Account, yet neither of them ever knew *James* "*Naylor* a Priſoner in *York* Caſtle. Alſo *Judith Key*, Widdow, "aged about Eighty Years, and hath lived in the City of *York* "Fifty years or upwards, and near Thirty years of the time hath "gone under the Name of a *Quaker*, and her Houſe alwayes at "Friends ſervice; ſhe affirms, that in all that time ſhe knows that "*James Naylor* never was a Priſoner in *York* Caſtle.

Witneſs their Hands *Thomas Wait*, *Judith Key*,
Edward Nightingall, *John Hall*.

" THis may certifie all Persons to whom this present " Writing shall come, that I *Audry Nunns*, Wife of *John* " *Nunns*, formerly Wife of *Thomas Bayock* Goaler of *York* Ca- " stle, was well acquainted with *James Naylor*, and to my know- " ledge he was never Prisoner in *York* Castle in all his time.

York, *this* 12*th of* April, 78. *Witness my Hand,* Audry Nunnes.

" THis *Audry Nunnes* above-mention'd saith, that she and " her former Husband *Thomas Bayock* entred in the year " 1651. and kept the Goal six years (and saith, she durst swear it " if required: she keeps an Inn in the City) This we are Wit- " nesses to, as also to the Certificate above.

Edward Nightingall, Jo. Tayler, John Hall.

See now, Reader, how we have traced and evidently detected *William Craven* in his Certificate, and found him false in his Evidence, to his own and his Abettor *William Haworth*'s utter Disgrace; for publishing such a malicious Slander against *James Naylor*, as that *Mary was a Whore, and Christ was a Bastard*; and *W. Haworth* most wickedly charging the People called *Quakers* therewith, as being *one of their Doctrines*, for which let Shame cover this *Independent* Teacher, and those that take his part.

And now to conclude, we have this further to add, appealing to our more moderate Neighbours in *Hertford*, who have known us many years, whether they ever apprehended us to be of so Unchristian Practices in our Conversation; for if there be such Antichristian Principles and Blasphemous Tenents held and professed by us (as *William Haworth* and his Adherents have wickedly scandalized us withal) they would sometime or other break forth into Unsavoury and Antichristian Practices (as Christ saith) *By their Fruits you shall know them.* But it doth most evidently appear now what the drift of W.H. and his Accomplices designed

ſigned in their ſcribling and conteſting againſt us, that by writing and aſſerting Lyes they may render us as odious as may be (not only to get *our Neſt at* Hertford (as he calls it) *broken up* (which W. H. ſaith, *its high time it were*) but alſo (as much as in him lies) to render us ſuch as aſſert Blaſphemous Principles (becauſe he hath gotten ſome Forgers to witneſs it againſt one or two Perſons (all which is deny'd) that ſo our Lives and Eſtates might be indanger'd through their Malice, by caſting that upon many which is unqueſtionably falſe concerning any one, as by what hath been before ſaid doth more fully appear.

And as for our Principles, we are ſtill ready by the Lord's aſſiſtance to maintain them by Scripture and otherwiſe in Print and Teſtimony to all ingenuous and impartial Perſons: but it ſeems evident it is, our Deſtruction he longs for, or otherwiſe he would not print ſuch horrible Lyes of us: Oh Wicked Wretch!

And now hear *James Naylor*'s own Confeſſions to Chriſt Jeſus, out of his Books.

[*Poſſeſſion of the Living Faith*] printed about 1658. and reprinted 1664. and inſerted after the *Preface* in the later Impreſſion (viz.) "Chriſt Jeſus, the *Immanuel*, (of whoſe Sufferings "the Scriptures declare) him alone I confeſs before men, for "whoſe ſake I have denyed whatever was dear to me in this "World, that I might win him, and be found in him, and not "in my ſelf, whoſe Life and Vertue I find daily manifeſt, &c. In "the Fear of God the Father, in Honour to Jeſus Chriſt, &c. "He was a perfect Example at *Jeruſalem*, p. 6. This Redemp-"tion I found in Chriſt Jeſus, &c. pag. 20, 21. Concerning the Name of Chriſt, viz. "That he ſits at God's Right Hand in "Heavenly Places—— by his Sufferings to redeem them —— and "they who are gather'd into this Name, hold it as a Holy Pow-"er, and DARE NOT BLASPHEME IT—— Let every one "that names the Name of Chriſt depart from Iniquity, which "Name to ſuch is Salvation, pag. 65. Our Lord and Saviour "Jeſus Chriſt, &c. That the holy Name of Chriſt may be glo-"rified in you, &c. pag. 71, 74. (as printed with others of his Books.

James Naylor's *Love to the Loſt*, printed about the year 1655. He confeſſeth to the "Redeemer Chriſt Jeſus, pag. 18. The "Reproach of Chriſt as great Riches, pag. 19. Chriſt honour-"ed as Law-giver, Judge and King, pag. 32. Chriſt Jeſus "God's Righteouſneſs, pag. 36.—and his Son, pag. 37—to the "ſame Spirit which raiſed Jeſus from the Dead—all as they are "baptized therein grow into one God the Father, and the Son "Jeſus Chriſt, pag. 47. Follow Chriſt, pag. 50. Suffer the "loſs of all to witneſs Chriſt, pag. 51. God the Father hath "given his Son for a Leader and Guide, p. 52. Now *Iſrael*— "of them was Chriſt to be born, was made of a Woman under "the Law, pag. 68. God the Father revealed, and his Power "and Godhead in his Son Jeſus Chriſt, which in him dwells, &c. pag. 70. [*Thus far* James Naylor.]

Obſ. Now ſee how contrary theſe ſerious Confeſſions of the Honour, Power and Glory of Jeſus Chriſt, and his being the Son of God, &c. are to what *William Haworth* and *William Craven* have accuſed him; and how unlikely their Accuſation is, and how it ſavours of a Lye and Forgery, or a groſs Miſtake at leaſt againſt J. N.

Alſo in his Vindication and Anſwer upon his Examination at the Seſſions at *Appleby*, in the 11th moneth, 1652. in the Book entituled, *Saul's Errand*, pag. 25. "Chriſt is not divided, if he "be, he is no more Chriſt: I witneſs that Chriſt who is God and "Man, &c.——ſeperate God and Man and he is no more Chriſt, pag. 31. "I own no other Chriſt but he who witneſſed a good "Confeſſion before *Pontius Pilate*, pag. 32. This may ſufficiently detect W. H. and his Reproachful Calumnies againſt J. N. and us about Jeſus Chriſt.

His Allegation for his ſaying, That theſe are the *Quakers* Doctrines, viz. [*That it was the Devil that ſuffered without the Gates; and that* Mary *was a Whore, and Chriſt a Baſtard*] runs thus, viz. *'Tis enough for me to call thoſe things of a Religious Concern which any* Quaker *writes or aſſerts in diſcourſe Doctrines, while they all pretend always to be guided by one Infallible Teacher, the Light Within*, p. 3.

1ſt, That

1*ſt*, That any *Quaker* hath writ or aſſerted ſuch Doctrine we find not; but the contrary (as before hinted) and look on't as meer Malice and Baſeneſs ſo to accuſe them.

2. Set Caſe any one had ſo writ or aſſerted, it follows not that the whole People are chargeable therewith [as the *Quakers* Doctrines without exception] that's no good Conſequence nor natural inference from their all pretending to be guided by the ſame infallible Teacher, the *Light within*.

See what a rare *Logician* this man is! Either the Light within muſt be chargeable with ſuch Doctrine againſt Chriſt and *Mary*, as before, or elſe all the Profeſſors of it, becauſe ſome pretending to it, have (if he ſayes true) ſo diſcourſed. What groſs Fallacy and falſe Logick is this! Whereas ſuch an Abſurdity was never the Aſſertion of the People called *Quakers*, *viz.* that either every one pretending to be guided by the Light Within, or diſtinguiſh't by the Name [*Quaker*] is therefore guided by the ſame Light in all Diſcourſes, or ſo to be owned by the ſaid People. Therefore his general Inference is ſilly and groundleſs, as well as unjuſt and Fallacious. Would the *Independent* Congregations be thus argu'd againſt, as to be thus univerſally charged with all the Private Opinions or Diſcourſes of every *Independent*, becauſe they all pretend the holy Scriptures to be the Rule, as well as the *Quakers* do the Light of Chriſt within? Let them anſwer this Queſtion, and ſee if the Reaſon will hold. Are they all willing thus to be concluded? If ſo, then

1*ſt*, Theſe, which are ſome of *William Haworth*'s Doctrines, may be charged on all the Independents, *viz.* *That* [*God*] *the Father poured out all his Wrath upon his Son Jeſus Chriſt.*

2. And his Brother *Powell*'s Doctrine, viz. *That Jeſus Chriſt was the Greateſt Sinner in the World*, vindicated by William Haworth.

3. And his aſſerting, *That* Paul *when a* Chriſtian *counted his Spiritual Obedience Loſs and Dung for Chriſt*; and that *this is very good, ſound, bleſſed and comfortable Doctrine, received by Millions of Saints in Heaven and Earth, &c.*

4. And *that our own Righteouſneſs* (*which the Apoſtle calls his own in* Phil. 3.9.) *conſiſts in thoſe Gifts and Vertues that the Spirit of*

of God works in our Minds, and we expreſs theſe outwardly, &c. [Thus far W. H.]

Now who and how many of the *Independent* Teachers beſides *William Haworth* will own and ſubſcribe theſe Doctrines as Orthodox? let them plainly anſwer us. If they are not generally owned by them, would they take it well to tell the World, theſe are the *Independents* Doctrines, which are ſo evidently impious againſt Jeſus Chriſt, againſt the Gifts and Vertues of God's holy Spirit, and ſpiritual Obedience among *Chriſtians*? But beſides his fallacious Attempts, to faſten theſe fore-cited Doctrines upon the *Quakers* (concerning the Virgin *Mary* and Chriſt) like a hardned wilful Perſon, having a Conſcience ſeared. He perſiſts in his general Accuſations and Slanders upon Reports againſt that ſolemn Atteſtation that we have given to the contrary, in anſwer to thoſe things before, which he has aſſerted to be the *Quakers* Doctrines, where we have ſaid, viz. 'To all which in the Sight 'and Preſence of the holy God we anſwer, We are certain that 'tis an abominable Slander in that General Charge upon the '*Quakers*; and he hath moſt infamouſly abuſed us in this matter, 'in ſaying, *Theſe are the* Quakers *Doctrines*, which we teſtifie 'againſt as ſo groſs and abominable that nothing like them hath 'entred into our Hearts ever to imagine, Much leſs to preach for 'Doctrine, as, *That it was the Devil that ſuffered without the* 'Gates; *and that* Mary *was a Whore, and Chriſt a Baſtard.* 'And yet he tells the World, *Theſe are the* Quakers *Doctrines.* 'What abominable Wickedneſs is this! thus to make infamous 'a People who abhor ſuch Blaſphemy, pag. 2. of our ſheet *Independent Agent.*

It appears that this *Independent* Preacher had not the Modeſty to tell the World, that ſuch and ſuch things are reported of ſome among the *Quakers*; but ſuch lying Reports as he has againſt us, he both eſpouſeth and aſſerts them poſitively, as, *Theſe are the* Quakers *Doctrines, their Blaſphemies*; not theſe are reported to have been diſcourſed by ſome among them. Thus the man's Out-rage, Malice and Revenge exceeds all Bounds of common Reaſon, Civility or Humanity, as if he were mad againſt us, and envyed not only our being at *Hertford* (wiſhing that *our Noſt* at *Hertford*

ford were broke up, as his words are) but even our Proſperity and Being (as a People) upon Earth, *as deſerving to be ſtoned to Death by the Righteous Law of God, if it were in force*, pag. 3. But 'tis much if he and his Accomplices and Abettors be not made aſhamed of his Malice and Out-rage ere we have done with him, if he will not ſtudy Quietneſs among his Neighbours, not doubting but God who is with us will rebuke his Baſeneſs and Malice againſt us; who having falſly accuſed us from malicious and falſe Reports of others, Suſpitions and Jealouſies of his own, proceeds thus, viz.

W. Haworth, *My Thoughts are, That the* Quakers *no more believe Chriſt to be a real Man in Heaven, then I believe there is a Man in the Moon*, pag. 4.

Reply, No wonder he ſhould harbour Evil and Unbelieving Thoughts of us, and what we have confeſſed to Chriſt's real and moſt glorious Manhood in the Heavens, ſince he is ſo apt to believe, aſſert and ſpread lying Reports and Slanders againſt us for Truths, if it were poſſible to deſtroy us from off the Face of the Earth: Such as are given up to believe and aſſert Lyes, will diſbelieve and oppoſe the Truth: He would have us appear bad, and therefore hee'l believe no good of us. But why thinks he the *Quakers* do not believe Chriſt to be a real Man? His main and frequent Reaſon is, he ſaith, *We ſay that the Soul of Chriſt is in every Saint, and that his Body is changed as to ſubſtance*, pag. 5, and 7. of his Sheet. For the firſt he quotes the 6th page of our *Teſtimony*, where we confeſs Chriſt's Spiritual Preſence with his Saints, which he dares not deny, he having confeſſed Chriſt's Soul to be his Spirit from *Luke* 23.46. in his *Antidote*, and we have oppoſed his arguing againſt the extent of Chriſt's Soul (or Spirit) to the Saints on Earth, ſeeing he is both God and Man; his Soul or Spirit, even as Man, as Mediator, virtually and effectually (through his divine Power and Authority) extends and reaches to the Saints on Earth; and at length he is made to grant, that *the Man Chriſt is virtually preſent on Earth*, in his Book *Jeſ. of Naz.* p. 20. l. 7. *But how can this be, that Chriſt's Soul ſhould be in the Saints on Earth? for then* (ſays he) *'tis immenſe, and turned into a New God*, pag. 5. of his Anſwer.

Whereas

Whereas it is virtually in the Saints, through the Divine Power of the Father, being both God and Man, without destroying, annihilating or confounding the *Properties of the Manhood with the Deity*, or *leaving his Body dead in Heaven*, as has been most vainly argu'd by this *Independent*; for does the Virtue of the Vine in the Branches and Fruit leave the Vine or Root empty and dead, because it extends to every Branch?

Besides his own Confession, viz. *That the Deity perfects all good* IN US, *but then the Humanity is in union with it, and* ACTS *with it, and they must not be put asunder*; and that *the Deity acts in it and through it as an Organ or Instrument.*

What's more plain, then that the Deity & Manhood of Christ do act together in Union in perfecting all good in us? Does not then the Soul of Christ extend to the Saints on Earth? When will this Adversary see how he is self-condemned and confuted! For do the Deity and Manhood of Christ together act and perfect all Good IN US, and yet his Soul have no place in us, nor so much as extend to us? And what though the Manhood does not extend so far as the Deity, which is infinite, is it a good Inference, that therefore it cannot extend to Saints or Men on Earth? Are they so infinitely remote from the Man Christ Jesus their Head? But his Inferences and Arguing against us in this matter is like his concluding, *that we deny the Manhood of Christ*, from our confessing to the Change, Spirituality, and Glory of his Body, and the powerful extent of his Soul, and spiritual Presence to and in the Saints on Earth, which does not at all lessen the substantial Dignity, but exalt it; so that instead of denying or disannulling the Man Christ Jesus, we magnifie him more then *William Haworth* allows of, that is the Case.

One great Exception that lies heavy upon our Adversary *William Haworth*'s Argument, and which he gets not off nor answers, is his confessing *Satan to be an Angel, yet but a Creature*; and notwithstanding, *that he is here on Earth to tempt the Saints because he is not yet bound in Hell*, pag. 36. of his *Jesus of Nazareth*. So that still he allows Satan more Power to tempt the Saints (though in many places at once far distant) then the Man Christ

to

to relieve them, though he be their Mediator and Head, and is touched with the feeling of their Infirmities, and succours them that are tempted, and has promised to be with his Disciples to the end of the World.

But says *William Haworth*, *It is the Will of God, that Satan should yet be here on Earth to tempt the Saints, he is not yet bound up in Hell.*

What then! is it the Will of God, that the heavenly MAN Christ Jesus (who is the Son of God) should remain bound in Heaven, so as not to visit and relieve his Saints or Members on Earth; nor his Soul or Spirit so much as extend to them? Has Satan more Liberty and Priviledge given him of God then his dear Son Christ Jesus has? Oh miserable and uncomfortable Doctrine!

To his arguing, *That the Soul of Christ cannot be in Millions Myriads of places, no not in two places at once; for then it would be immense, turned into a New God, &c.*

He has argued better for Satan then thus. Is Satan immense then? He has placed Satan's Liberty to tempt the Saints on Earth and limiting Christ to Heaven (the mean while) upon the *Will of God, Jes. Nat.* pag. 36. so that his Plea of Christ's Soul or Manhood not being God or immense is now removed as no Argument either to prove it in no wise IN the Saints, or not extending to them on Earth; seeing Satan himself reacheth to many places at once; and Christ Jesus is above and greater then he. And sure the Will of God is more eminently concerned in Christ the Mediator, for the Good of Mankind, and the Consolation of the Saints in their Tryals, then in Satan's tempting them. And seeing we have always believed and confessed the Immortality and intire Beings of the Souls of all other Men, it must needs be evidently unjust to accuse us with *denying the Manhood of Christ*, or Jesus of Nazareth, *to have a Being both as to his Soul and Body*, as this Adversary has frequently insinuated.

And as for Christ's Body being changed, *as to substance*, which he often infers upon us, from our arguing against his asserting Christ's Body (in Heaven) *to be a Natural Body, of an Earthly Substance.* The Terms *Natural* and *Earthly*, as given to the

Glorious Body of Christ were and are offensive to us, as well as contrary to his own confessing, *that it is such a Glorious Body, that it is more bright then a Thousand Suns.* So that then it must needs be a very glorious heavenly Body, which sure is not the same with Earthly (neither is Natural and Spiritual both one quality.) And we believing such a Change in the Body of Christ, we do not thereby (nor ever did) conclude, that the Body of Christ which suffered was annihilated, and that his Flesh saw Corruption. No such matter. May there not then be a wonderful Change in the Body, and yet the Substance not annihilated nor destroyed? Nor does it follow from our not believing nor owning his Characters of *natural* and *Earthly* on Christ's Glorious Body, that therefore nothing of that Body remains, or is in being, as he falsly and frequently argues in his Books. For he has confessed, *Christ hath a Glorious Body, and all the Saints shall have like Bodies*, Phil. 3. ult. *And that both his is, and theirs will be Spiritual, heavenly, glorious for Qualities*, pag. 29. of his *Jesus of Nazareth.* And grants it *Angelical, Spiritual, Celestial as to Qualities*, pag. 31. ibid.

If SPIRITUAL, and HEAVENLY or CELESTIAL, &c. be Qualities, then NATURAL, and EARTHLY, and CARNAL are Qualities also. And if we must believe our *Adversary* when he says, *Christ's Body in Heaven is very glorious, spiritual and heavenly for Qualities, yea, brighter then a Thousand Suns*, then we must not believe him where he says, *'tis natural, earthly, &c.* which are contrary to *spiritual* and *heavenly.* If hee'l yet infer, that then there's *nothing* of the Substance in being, we deny his Inference, it being also contrary to his own Confession, viz. *That the same Substance remains*: so that it may be so wonderfully changed as to Qualities, and yet the Substance neither destroyed, lost, or nullified.

But to wave many more of *W. Haworth's* Untruths and false Consequences in his Books and Sheet, take two or three Instances of his Falshoods and Forgeries, which are very obvious in matter of fact, in the 6th and 7th pages of his Sheet touching Christ's Ascention, where he says, that *when we say, the same man ascended, by ascending into HEAVEN* (he says) *we mean the Globe*

Globe which we call the EARTH: Which is all one as to say, that by *HEAVEN* we mean *EARTH*. For proof of this notorious and most absurd Falshood he refers the Reader to the 16th page of his last, and saith, *According to our Principle there was nothing of the Man Christ to ascend.*

As if we allowed *nothing* of the Man Christ, either of Spirit or Body to have a Being (after his Resurrection) to ascend; a most horrid Falshood brought to prove another such as his Book and Page quoted is stufft with. His pretended Reason is answered else-where in this, viz. *If the Body was changed as to Substance, &c.* For though it was changed, and become more excellent, refined and glorious in the Substance, it follows not that 'twas annihilated.

He addeth, *And the humane Soul Immense.*

Another Falshood still imposed on us in his own Unscriptural Phrase. Though Christ be God and Man in a most glorious Union and Power, yet the Manhood is not the Deity, nor the Deity the Manhood, yet inseparable in the Heavenly Man Christ, who is Lord from Heaven.

W. H. saith, *He remembers one of* G. Fox's *Interpretations, that when 'tis said, he took upon him the Seed of* Abraham, *that Seed was the Light within.* On this we asked, Where does *Geo. Fox* so interpret that Scripture? we do not believe he ever did so. *William Haworth* gives us this answer, viz. *I did not say, I received it in his Books, but I Remember, &c. I have heard it, and from good hands, whether they have heard it from his Mouth, or read it in his Books, I Know not—I do believe it.*

Rep. Observe how wonderful Credulous this man's Malice makes him against us, to make a direct Charge from a Report, viz. That he *remembers* that it was *one* of *G. Fox*'s Interpretations on the Scripture cited. But now he remembers he hath *heard it so* REPORTED, and he does believe it. One while, he remembers it was *Geo. Fox*'s Interpretation; another while, he believes it, as having had it from other Hands, but whose Hands he tells us not, that we may know or enquire how good: it is greatly to be questioned, whether he

he has not herein belyed good Hands to cover his Lye against G. F. and us. But to support his Credit in this matter, he bids us, *Hear* Naylor *interpret this thing in the very same way*, Love to the Loſt, *Preface*, *viz.* "So to the Light within—makes "for the gathering Creatures together, to that one Name and "Seed wherein all the Nations of the Earth are bleſſed. Do but ſee how hard the man's put to it for a Proof to ſave his Credit. But how much beſides the Point in two reſpects, *1ſt*, as to the Perſon; *2dly*, as to the Thing: for *1ſt*, *James Naylor* is not *G. Fox*. *2dly*, The Light of Chriſt within (or what proceeds from him the Root) making for the gathering Creatures together in that one Name and Seed, wherein the Nations Rom. 1. are bleſſed, is not the ſame with ſaying, *That Seed of* Abraham, *which according to the Fleſh Chriſt took upon him, was the Light within*; nor either of them the Interpretation of that Scripture. For that Name and Seed wherein Nations are bleſſed, is Chriſt himſelf. Not that the Fleſhly Seed (taken by Chriſt) was the Light within. How miſerably hath this Adverſary come off! *Oportet mendacem eſſe memorem.*

Alſo, where *William Haworth* accuſeth the *Quakers*; Now to ſay, *That what* Paul *ſaith in* Rom. 4. 6. *is contrary to what* David *ſaith in* Pſal. 32. 2. For this he quoteth the eighth page of our *Vindication*, Doct. 11. with this addition, viz. *They cite the words of* Romans 4. 6. *and then ſay contrary to* Pſalm 32. 2. *Thus* (ſayes he) *they ſet one Scripture againſt another.*

Rep. Here he has committed an abominable Falſhood twice over; *1ſt*, in his *Teſt. Naz.* pag. 8, 9. and *2dly*, in his Sheet. For in our *Vindication* there is no ſuch thing, as that *what* Paul *ſayes*, Rom. 4. 6. *is contrary to* Pſal. 32. 2. Neither do we ſay, that theſe words cited *Rom.* 4. 6. are contrary to *Pſal.* 32. 2. Nor yet do we ſet one Scripture againſt another, as he has moſt falſly accuſed us, but his own falſe Expoſition and Perverſion on *David's* and *Paul's* words in *Pſalm* 32. 2. and *Rom.* 4. 6. As where *David* deſcribes the Bleſſedneſs of the Man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without Works. *What Works*, ſayes *William Haworth*? and then anſwers, *Done*

by

by the Spirit surely; for such were David's *Works*: see his *Antidote*, page 18. line 25. Whereas 'twas not *David*'s words, but these last words of *William Haworth*, viz. [*DONE BY THE SPIRIT SURELY*] (these were shewed by great Characters) that we opposed to *David*'s words, *Psal.* 32. 2. As to say, *That God imputeth Righteousness without Works done by the Spirit*, this we affirm is contrary to *David* in *Psalm* 32.2. where the blessed Qualification of that man unto whom the Lord imputeth not Iniquity is intimated, viz. *in whose Spirit there is NO Guile.* Now a man's Spirit can neither be sanctified nor clear from Guile without the Work of the Spirit of God. Therefore to say that a man is imputatively Righteous or blessed of God, *without any Works done in him by his Spirit*, is erroneous, and directly contrary to *David*'s Testimony in the *Psalm* cited; See now where the Contradiction is evidently placed by us. 'Tis between *W. Haworth* and the Prophet *David*, and not between the Apostle *Paul* and *David*.

Another of *William Haworth*'s Forgeries is, that *William Bates* saith, He is ONLY SORRY *for his Weakness and Over-sight in giving him any such Answer*. We told him, he addeth [*Only Sorry*] and makes himself work on this Lye. To come off with an Excuse here, he tells us, *The word* [ONLY] *the Printer should have put into another Character*. As if another Character would make that true which is an apparent Lye, as in his saying, *That* William Bates *(in his Retractation) saith, he is only sorry*, &c. for 'twas none of his saying, nor sense of all he says in his Retractation, and neither consist in the Emphasis which a different Character may shew. And *William Haworth* does not at all amend his matter, by saying, that William Bates *mentions not any more that he is sorry for, but that he gave him such an Answer; if for nothing else, for that only*. Here he makes his own implicite Consequence, to prove that *William Bates* said that in his Retractation which he did not say, *viz.* that he is ONLY SORRY, &c. which words are not there. *William Haworth* is a Forger in this and many more things against us then as yet we divulged. Besides, *William Bates* did not only acknowledge

knowledge his Weakneſs in giving any ſuch Anſwer, as is cited in his Retractation; but alſo clears the People called *Quakers* from teaching or holding any ſuch thing to his Knowledge; and likewiſe from *William Haworth*'s Reproaching them on that Occaſion, *as being No* Chriſtians, *but Seducers*, &c. which with many more Falſe Aſperſions he has caſt upon us.

Subſcribed on the Behalf of Truth, our ſelves, and the reſt of our Friends concerned,

Hertford, 3d mon. 1678.

Henry Stout,
Henry Sweeting,
Richard Thomas,
Richard Martin,
Edward Plumſted.

The Publication of this has been occaſionally delayed; for 'twas writ not long after our Adverſary's Anſwer came out.

A Postscript, *in Answer to* William Haworth's QUESTIONS.

SInce that *William Haworth* hath been far louder in his Charge against us then in his Proofs, either from the Dispute at *Barbican*, *London*, which in his *Antidote* he unjustly quoted; or from any of our Writings since pretended by him for Proof, viz. *That we deny the Manhood of Christ, and Jesus of* Nazareth *to be the Christ.* But on the contrary, to discover his shortness and failure of proof, he is fain after all to Query us, and put Questions to sift us further (p. 8.) for matter against us. However, wee'l adventure a brief and plain Answer.

Question, *I do but query what is become of that Flesh wherein he (i. Christ) was manifested? is that Flesh now in being? and if so, where is it, in every place, or circumscribed in Heaven?*

Answer, That Flesh saw no Corruption, but was raised from the Dead. *Acts* 2.31. Christ did rise in that Body wherein he suffered, and in the same ascended into the Heavens, where the Patriarch *David* did not, as to his Body, which was in the Sepulchre, *Acts* 2. 29, to ver. 36. And that very Body of Christ which was rais'd from the dead, or that flesh which saw no Corruption, how should it but be in being? || (that is, in that Spiritual Sense we have given) seeing he dyed not again,

|| In our Testimony for the Man Christ, pag. 7. we plainly told him our Belief, viz. "That the "Man Christ did neither vanish "nor perish in any thing essenti-"al to him, either as to his Soul, "Spirit or Body.

according to *Rom. 6. 9*, Knowing Christ being raised from the dead, dyeth no more, Death hath no more dominion over him; his dying was only as to the Body, he was put to death as concerning the Flesh, therefore the Flesh was raised from the dead. [*Circumscribed*] It is so far circumscribed or encompassed in the Heavens as 'tis capable of, and as is proper to it; and though it be spiritual and glorious, yet *a Body*, therefore not in every place where God is. [And as he has told us, *It is not limited or confined to any one place or corner (as it were) of Heaven.*] To be Omnipresent is only proper to God, and not to Bodies.

Q. *How do they but deny the Manhood of Christ, that say, the Body of Jesus is changed as to Substance, and his Soul is in every Saint?*

Answ. 1*st*, They do not deny the Manhood of Christ that say his Body is so changed, as to the quality and glory of it, that it is a spiritual, heavenly and glorious Body, in a higher state then when on Earth under Sufferings: this is no annihilating of the Body. 2*dly*, That his Soul doth powerfully extend to, and is in every Saint in some sense and degree; this must needs be, if it *act together in union with the Deity in perfecting all good in us*, as our Adversary has confessed; as also, *that it is virtually in the Saints* Though we grant that it is in more fulness in himself then in us, yet of his fulness we have all received.

Q. *They own they say the real Birth, Suffering and Resurrection of Christ; but do they own his Intercession in his Manhood as an High Priest in Heaven?*

Answ. Yes, we do. He is entred into Heaven it self to appear in the Face of God for us; yet not wholely exclusively out of the Saints. For this High Priest, who

who is set on the Right Hand of the Throne of the Majesty in the Heavens, is a *Minister* of the Sanctuary, and of the true Tabernacle which is with men, even with such whose Minister & Leader Christ is. And God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our Hearts, crying *Abba*, Father. The Spirit makes intercession with Sighs and Groans, &c.

W.H. *So that as man he is not materially here on Earth.*

Answ. An impertinent and fallacious Addition, if he own him not as man in any sense on Earth. For doth not this imply, that as Man he is immaterially on earth. If by *materially* he means he is not corporally on earth, as in the dayes of his Flesh, we grant it. But then we may not deny his being on Earth Spiritually and virtually as Man, he being the spiritual and heavenly Man, the Lord FROM Heaven, and a quickening Spirit. Else how are any on Earth quickened by him? And how did he walk in the midst of the seven Golden Candle-sticks, which were the seven Churches? *Rev* 1.

W.H. *These are Scripture words,* Acts 3. 21. *Whom the Heaven must receive (or contein, the reading will bear it) until the time of the restitution of all things. Is not that* [whom] *the Man Christ? His Deity cannot be conteined anywhere.*

Answ. 1st, Whom the Heaven must receive or take, it is not *contein* nor *retein*: and sometimes Heaven in the New Testament-Scriptures is put for God himself. 2. It is [times] in the plural, *viz.* whom Heaven (chiefly respecting God that dwells therein) must receive or take until the *times* of the restitution (which is the reparation or reformation) of all things, spoken by the holy Prophets. Those times are the Gospel times, and the last dayes, wherein God is making good his Promise of the Blessing in Christ to all Nations, in turning every

man that receives him from Iniquity, *Acts* 3. 26 So that now the last *Adam* or second Man is revealed from Heaven, and known to be a quickening Spirit, and the Lord FROM Heaven. That [*whom*] was Jesus Christ, the Heavenly Man, whom Heaven received into Glory, into a more hidden condition (when the Earth had contemned and rejected him) until those more glorious times of his Out-goings and Discoveries in the latter dayes, for the gathering of Nations and Peoples, and blessing them, in turning them from their Iniquities. And though those Times of Restitution are begun, he who is the Restorer shall yet more fully and universally appear for the accomplishment of that his Work.

Q. *Is not Heaven a place remote from the Earth?*

Answ. Heaven is higher then the Earth, and so distinct or remote. But there is a plurality of Heavens; some more near, and some more remote: as also spiritual Heavens, as well as natural.

Q. *Is not Conteining Circumscribing?*

Answ. What's contein'd within the compass or circumference of place, more or less, may be said to be circumscribed.

W. H. *So that as man he is not on Earth locally.*

Answ. Why is [*locally*] added? In what other sense then locally is Christ as man on earth? Is he not on earth spiritually as a *quickning Spirit*, being the Lord from heaven? even that man by whom came the Resurrection of the dead? who quickens whom he will? If in no sense this second man appear on Earth, how are any quickned by him?

Q. *Is that Restitution of all things fulfilled, or yet to come? answer plainly.*

Answ. That Restitution of all things, spoken by the Mouth

Mouth of all God's Prophets is not wholly fulfilled. But both the times thereof are begun, and Jesus Christ is about and carrying on the work of restitution fore-told. The Deliverer is come out of *Zion*, and the Restorer of Paths to dwell in is come; he is on his way: And he will yet more fully and gloriously appear to fulfil the Promises spoken of him.

W.H. Obj. *But belike they have a notion, which in time they will speak out, That Christ was Man before he was a Man, i.e.* (*which* Penington *saith*) *heavenly Flesh, Blood and Bones came down from Heaven, and tabernacled in that Body; That was the Man Christ that came into the Man Christ.*

Answ. Whether he has rightly cited *Isaac Penington* in all these words or no, is some question. What Book and Page of his they are to be found in, he tells us not. That *I.P.* in some Questions hath distinguished between that Flesh and Blood of Christ which came down from Heaven (which is meat and drink indeed, of an inward, spiritual & eternal nature) and the Body, Flesh or Vail, that was prepared for him, is true. And what has our Adversary to say to this? Does it thence follow, that Christ was man before he was a man? or that there are two man Christs, one that came into the other? what absurd Nonsense would this man brand us withal? might not Christ the Son of God be the heavenly man, the mediator, before he took upon him the Body that was prepared for him: which is not a being man before he was a man, but before he was so invested, or came into that Body. Surely his saying, *A Body hast thou prepared me*, Heb. 10.5. does not make him two man Christs.

THE END.